

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, and the remarks that follow as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes and remarks are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 2-12 and 15-25, and amended claim 1, 13 and 14 are in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-15 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347) in view of Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,703).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part,

“An information processing apparatus...

wherein when one or more of said plurality of electronic apparatuses are disconnected from said network, previously stored command definition information is **temporarily stored in said storage means for a predetermined period of time.**” (underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Everhart and Nguyen as applied by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the above-recited feature of amended independent claim 1.

At page 5 of the present Final Office Action, the Examiner admits that Everhart does not teach “a means for connection status detection that is further utilized to add and delete command

information.” The Examiner apparently relies on Nguyen to teach such feature. However, Nguyen does not mention a device being disconnected from a network or previously stored command definition information for such disconnected device being temporarily stored in a storage means for a predetermined period of time.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, as amended herein, is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Nguyen.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 13 and 14 are also believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Nguyen.

Claims 2, 5-10, 15 and 18-23 depend from one of amended independent claims 1, 13 and 14, and, due to such dependency, are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Nguyen for at least the above-described reasons.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-15 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Nguyen et al., and further in view of Vanbuskirk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,157).

Claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 depend from one of amended independent claims 1, 13 and 14, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart and Nguyen for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Vanbuskirk to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart and Nguyen. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart, Nguyen and Vanbuskirk.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Nguyen et al., and further in view of Diehl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,666).

Claims 11 and 24 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 13, respectively, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart and Nguyen for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Diehl to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart and Nguyen. Therefore, claims 11 and 24 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart, Nguyen and Diehl.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Nguyen et al., and further in view of Peck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,375,063).

Claims 12 and 25 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 13, respectively, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart and Nguyen for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Peck to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart and Nguyen. Therefore, claims 12 and 25 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart, Nguyen and Peck.


Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By: 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800